

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 2462 221296US-O-PCT 10/088,500 07/09/2002 Chikako Matsumoto **EXAMINER** 05/13/2004 22850 7590 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. DELCOTTO, GREGORY R 1940 DUKE STREET PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 1751

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No. Applicant(s)		
	10/088,500	MATSUMOTO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory R. Del Cotto	1751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_·		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 4-9 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/26/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		p-152)

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 4-9 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

Art Unit: 1751

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1751

Claims 1-3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP 474,023.

'023 teaches an emulsion-type aqueous cosmetic composition containing a mixture of oil and fat, wherein said fat is present in at least 70 wt% of said mixture, and at least 50 wt% of said fat is at least one lipid selected from the group consisting of higher fatty acids, etc.; an aqueous medium, and an emulsifying agent, said mixture of oil and fat being dispersed in said aqueous medium with said emulsifying agent. See Abstract. Suitable emulsifying agents include a polyoxyethylene alkyl ether phosphoric acid ester having the same general formula as recited by the instant claims. See page 4, lines 20-50. Additionally, glyceryl ethers are preferably incorporated into the composition as absorption promoting agents for the lipid. See page 5, lines 1-20. Specifically, '023 teaches compositions containing 3% ceramide, 1% cholesterol, 0.5% glyceryl ether, 0.5% squalene, 2% silicone oil, 1.5% sodium lauryl polyoxyethylene ether phosphate, sorbitan monostearate, 5% glycerin, 10% ethanol, and water. See page 6, lines 10-45. Note that, the Examiner asserts that the glyceryl ether as specifically taught by '023 would be the same as the the glyceryl ethers as recited by the instant claims because '023 teaches glyceryl ethers having the same general formula as recited by the instant claims. Note that, with respect to instant claim 10, the Examiner asserts that the composition specifically taught by '023 would inherently have the same foamability properties as recited by the instant claims because '023 teaches compositions containing the same glyceryl ether and phosphate compounds in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1751

Accordingly, the broad teachings of '023 anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Alternatively, even if the broad teachings of '023 are not sufficient to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed glyceryl ether of the composition in order to provide the optimum cleaning properties to the composition since '023 teaches that the type of glyceryl ether added to the composition may be varied.

Claims 1-3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 245,756.

'756 teaches a composition comprising a basic amino acid salt of a higher aliphatic phosphate and an alpha monoalkyl glyceryl ether. See Abstract. The amount of phosphate added to the composition may be 0.01 to 5 wt% and the amount of ether added to the composition may be 0.1 to 20 parts by weight of the phosphate. See page 3, lines 22-40.

Note that, with respect to instant claim 10, the Examiner asserts that '756 would encompass compositions having the same foamability properties as recited by the instant claims because '756 suggests compositions containing the same glyceryl ether and phosphate compounds in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims.

'756 does not teach, with sufficient specificity, a detergent composition containing a phosphate ester, a glyceryl ether, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1751

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a detergent composition containing a phosphate ester, a glyceryl ether, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '756 suggest a detergent composition containing a phosphate ester, a glyceryl ether, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/088,500 Page 7

Art Unit: 1751

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory R. Del Cotto Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751

GRD May 10, 2004